


REMARKS

On pages 2 and 3 of the August 12, 2005 Office Action, the Applicant is required to elect the claims of one of five species of the claimed invention identified by the Examiner for prosecution in the present application if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, species IV identified by the Examiner. Of the claims currently pending (the Group I claims from the March 28, 2005 Restriction Requirement issued in the present application), the following claims are readable upon species IV: 1-5, 28-32, 37-45, and 58-69.

The Applicant traverses the requirement to elect a species in the August 12 2005 Office Action because, among other reasons, species IV and V illustrate the same subject matter. In particular, figure 24 of species 4 is simply an exploded perspective view of the same assembly shown in cross-section in figure 26 of species 5. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 9, lines 3-8 of the present application as originally filed, figures 24-26 are described as being views of the same anchor assembly and base leg bracket assembly. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the requirement to elect a species as set forth in the August 12, 2005 Office Action, and that the Examiner at least combine species 4 and 5 in the same species.

Early, favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if she believes it would be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Christopher B. Austin
Registration No. 41,592

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
401 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 661-2100